

AKERMAN LLP

Kanika D. Corley (State Bar No. 223607)

kanika.corley@akerman.com

601 West Fifth Street, Suite 300

Los Angeles, CA 90071

Telephone: (213) 688-9500

Facsimile: (213) 627-63422

THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY

Al-Amyr Sumar (*admitted pro hac vice*)

al-amyn.sumar@nytimes.com

620 8th Avenue

New York, NY 10018

Telephone: (202) 862-7705

Facsimile: (212) 556-4634

Attorneys for Defendant

THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TARA READE,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:22-CV-00543-WBS-KJN

**REPLY TO NON-OPPOSITION TO
MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES AND
COSTS**

Date: March 20, 2023

Time: 1:30 pm

Crtrm.: 5

///

///

///

///

///

I. INTRODUCTION

On December 13, 2022, Defendant The New York Times Company (“The Times”) timely moved for an award of attorney’s fees and costs under California’s anti-SLAPP statute, C.C.P. § 425.16(c)(1). Under the Local Rules of this Court, Plaintiff Tara Reade’s opposition was due on December 28, 2022. *See* E.D. Local Rule 78-230(c) (any opposition “shall be filed and served no later than fourteen (14) days after the motion was filed”). Plaintiff has filed no opposition, and The Times’s motion should therefore be granted on the basis of consent as well as the merits set forth in our moving memorandum of law.

II. ANALYSIS

Two consequences flow from Plaintiff’s failure to file an opposition. First, Plaintiff cannot appear and be heard at any hearing on The Times’s motion for fees. Under the Local Rules of this Court, “[n]o party will be entitled to be heard in opposition to a motion at oral arguments if opposition to the motion has not been timely filed by that party.” E.D. Local Rule 78-230(c).

Second, a “failure to file a timely opposition may also be construed by the Court as a non-opposition to the motion.” E.D. Local Rule 78-230(c). Courts in the Ninth Circuit have construed the failure to file an opposition to a motion for attorneys’ fees as a consent to the motion. *See Marcus v ABC Signature Studios, Inc.*, No. 17-cv-00148-RSWL-AJWx, 2017 WL 5592470, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2017) (granting motion for fees because of failure to oppose); *Minow v Lexus*, No. CV 06-7496-CAS (SHx), 2008 WL 11338145, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2008) (same). Plaintiff had proper notice of the motion and ample opportunity to oppose it in a timely fashion or seek additional time for filing. She did neither, and granting the motion on consent is appropriate under those circumstances.

///

///

///

///

///

///

III. CONCLUSION

For the above reasons and those stated in our moving memorandum of law, The Times respectfully requests that the Court order Plaintiff to pay \$70,645 in attorneys' fees, \$850.09 in costs, and any additional fees and costs incurred in connection with the filing of this motion.

DATED: January 6, 2023

AKERMAN LLP

By: /s/ Kanika D. Corley

Kanika D. Corley

Al-Amyr Sumar

Attorneys for Defendant

THE NEW YORK TIMES COMPANY

AKERMAN LLP

601 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 300
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071
TEL.: (213) 688-9500 – FAX: (213) 627-6342